

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 10-11 have been cancelled.

In the section entitled "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" on pages 2-3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-9 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Vaartstra (US 6,159,855) in view of Ahmed (US 4,468,283) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references. However, the language of claim 1 has been modified in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, inter alia:

providing the reactor chamber with a first gas outlet;

pumping away a first part of reaction products through the first gas outlet;

providing the reactor chamber with a second gas outlet opening formed in the reactor wall downstream of the substrate;

providing a connecting line connecting the second gas outlet opening to one of the inlet openings located upstream of the distributor plate for feeding a second part of the reaction products back to the one of the inlet openings.

Claim 1 of the instant application clearly recites that the reactor chamber has a gas outlet for pumping away reaction products through the gas outlet. Claim 1 of the instant application further recites that the reactor chamber has a further gas outlet opening formed in the reactor wall downstream of the substrate. It is thus clear and it can also be seen from Fig. 2 of the instant application that part of the reaction products are pumped away through the gas outlet and another part of the reaction products are fed through the further gas outlet opening back to an inlet upstream of the substrate and the distributor plate.

None of the cited references contains two gas outlet openings. Vaartstra shows one single outlet opening connected with the pump 46 for pumping away all the reaction products. Ahmed also shows one single gas outlet opening 6 for pumping away the reaction products and feeding them back in total through

the tube 19 and the discharge line 20 to the inlet opening 4. The outlet opening 8 is apparently not a gas outlet opening but rather a water exit tube (see column 4, lines 11-13). Therefore, Vaartstra and Ahmed show apparatuses, which have only one single gas outlet opening with different purposes. It is not obvious for a person skilled in the art to combine Vaartstra and Ahmed to provide an apparatus having two outlet openings serving different purposes, pumping one part of the reaction products through the first gas outlet opening and another part of the reaction products through the second gas outlet opening, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to 37 CFR Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Yonghong Chen
Reg. No. 56,150



For Applicants

YC

February 24, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101